Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
0001/001	Jim Tsudy Armstrong World Industries	Sections 6.2.1 & 6.2.5 Delete the word "estimated"	Rejected. Estimation is the only practical method for many contaminant sources. Requiring a stricter standard could amount to disallowing the IAQ Procedure in many circumstances. ~~Accepted~~ ~~TWO POINTS: THIS MAY OR MAY NOT BE EDITORIAL. ALSO, SOME PREFER ESTIMATED TO DETERMINED BECAUSE DETERMINED CAN BE INTERPRETED AS ACTUALLY MEASURED AS OPPOSED TO OTHER (ACCEPTABLE) MEANS OF ARRIVING AT THESE VALUES.~~
0001/0002	Jim Tsudy Armstrong World Industries	Section 6.2.2 Substitute "nationally recognized authority" for "cognizant authority"	Rejected. Cognizance is the essence of the intent, not recognition. Cognizance is knowledge of the subject at hand, recognition is knowledge of the authority by others. An authority may be well recognized by others but for reasons other than the authority's knowledge of the subject. ~~Accepted~~ ~~ALSO MAY NOT BE EDITORIAL. PERHAPS MORE IMPORTANTLY, TO WHICH NATION DOES NATIONALLY REFER? THIS IS AN INTERNATIONAL STANDARD, NOT US. MAYBE ANY NATION IS ACCPETABLE? I DON'T KNOW. DO INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED AUTHORITIES NOT COUNT? I'D RETAIN THE WORD COGNIZNANT. THERE ARE MANY AUTHORITIES OUT THERE WHO ARE COGNIZANT ON THE ISSUE.~~
0002/0001	Maury Wawryk Venmar CES	Section 6.2 Add "occupants and/or visitors"	~~Accepted~~ Rejected. This portion of the standard deals with code minimums, which are tied to occupants. One can always go beyond the minimum and design for visitors, but it is important to be clear that this is not required.
0003/0001	Todd Weiler Venmar CES	Ditto	~~Accepted~~ Rejected. This portion of the standard deals with code minimums, which are tied to occupants. One can always go beyond the minimum and design for visitors, but it is important to be clear that this is not required.
0004/0001	Luc Janelle Venmar CES	Ditto	~~Accepted~~ Rejected. This portion of the standard deals with code minimums, which are tied to occupants. One can always go beyond the minimum and design for visitors, but it is important to be clear that this is not required.

PM3006450029

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001

Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
0005/0001	John DiFazio Jr. CSMA	Move entire procedure to guideline	Rejected • The proposed IAQP is an alternative compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards. • The proposed IAQP is not likely to be used unless the designer has a high degree of confidence in the procedures and data since all assumptions must be thoroughly documented.
0005/0002	John DiFazio Jr. CSMA	Sections 6.2.1 & 6.2.5 Delete the words "or estimated" Delete the word "estimated"	~~Accepted~~ Rejected. Estimation is the only practical method for many contaminant sources. Requiring a stricter standard could amount to disallowing the IAQ Procedure in many circumstances. ~~SEE MY COMMENT ABOVE.~~
0005/0003	John DiFazio Jr. CSMA	Section 6.2.2 Substitute "nationally recognized authority" for "cognizant authority"	Rejected. Cognizance is the essence of the intent, not recognition. Cognizance is knowledge of the subject at hand, recognition is knowledge of the authority by others. An authority may be well recognized by others but for reasons other than the authority's knowledge of the subject. ~~Accepted in principle:~~ ~~Substitution of terms is accepted. Proposed definition of "nationally recognized authority" is not accepted. The proposed definition is too narrow in the context of the proposed addendum.~~ ~~NEEDS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CONTEXT OF TSHUDY COMMENT ABOVE.~~

PM3006450030

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001

Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
0005/0004	John DiFazio Jr. CSMA	Sections 6.2.1,6.2.2,6.2.5 Redefine "contaminates of concern"	Rejected. Definition refers back to contaminants of concern as ". found indoor at frequencies and levels to cause legitimate concern..." Thus the substantive change is to add the word "legitimate." This word has the connotation of being "rightful" or legal". The latter meaning is definitely not intended for the standard - contaminants could be considered which do not have a basis in law. The former meaning does not add specificity enforceability or to the standard to justify its inclusion. The commenter refers to the use of the term in UL 2117; but does not state the specific context. This committee has purposes different from the UL body and is entitled to reach a different conclusion. ~~Accepted~~ ~~INCLUDING THE "DEFINITION" IN 6.2.2. IS NOT EDITORIAL. IT MAY ALSO NOT BE ACCEPTABLE TO EVERYONE ON THE SUB AND MAIN COMMITTEES. THERE ARE ALMOST NO CONTAMINANTS FOR WHICH STANDARDIZED TEST METHODS HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED FOR USE INDOORS, BUT WE CAN STILL DESIGN TO THEM. NOTE: NOT VIOLATION OF PETITION HERE BECAUSE NONE OF THIS IS REQUIRED. THINK ABOUT WORKING ON A DEFINITION OF C OF C AND ADDING IT SEPARATELY AT A LATER DATE; THIS MIGHT BE ACCEPTABLE TO SOME OF THE COMMENTERS.~~
0005/0005	John DiFazio Jr. CSMA	Section 6.2 Redefine "perceived IAQ" Section 6.2.3 Redefine "perceived AQ" to "perceived IAQ"	Rejected. Commenter wishes to exclude "dissatisfaction related to temperature, humidity, lighting and psychosocial stressors." The committee does not wish to require the exclusion of these factors. For instance, low temperature has been shown to increase sensory acceptability of indoor air and may be considered in the IAQ procedure. ~~Accepted~~ ~~ADDING DEFINITION TO 6.2 IS NOT EDITORIAL. THIS DEFINITION PROBABLY NEEDS SOME REFINEMENT ANYWAY.~~ ~~WHAT ABOUT HIS SUGGESTION TO RETITLE 6.2.3? ARE YOU RECOMMENDING REJECTION?~~

PM3006450031

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001

Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
0006/0001	Dick Morris NAHB	Move entire procedure to guideline	Rejected The proposed IAQP is an alternative compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards. The proposed IAQP is not likely to be used unless the designer has a high degree of confidence in the procedures and data since all assumptions must be thoroughly documented. ~~There is nothing inherently wrong with two separate engineers arriving a separate ventilation rates depending on the procedures and methodology chosen. THIS LAST PARAGRAPH WAS INCLUDED IN THE RESPONSE ABOVE TO A SIMILAR COMMENT. ANY PARTICULAR REASON? PERSONALLY, I DON'T THINK YOU NEED IT; THE RESPONSE SEEMS STRONG ENOUGH TO ME.~~
0007/0001	Hal Levin BERG	Section 6.1 VRP Don't delete "O/A treatment when necessary"	Rejected. This addendum does not the bullet "O/A treatment when necessary". It was deleted in addendum 62r (which is currently in the public comment process) and replaced with more specific requirements. ~~Accept in principle OR ARE YOU REJECTING IT?~~ ~~The focus of this addendum is the IAQP. Prescriptive requirements for the treatment are being specifically addressed by another addenda. At such time this requirement is accepted, section will likely be modified in conjunction.~~

PM3006450032

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001

Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
0007/0002	Hal Levin BERG	Section 6.2.2 Add new contaminant concentration table	Rejected Table 3 and Appendix C are already referenced and the table values will be updated in a separate addendum. This addendum concentrates on the process for using the method, not the specific table values. ~~The value of the IAQP to the designer is the flexibility offered by a "performance criteria" approach. The addenda, as proposed, allow the designer to choose the "contaminants of concern" as well as targeted concentration limits from the authority deemed most appropriate by the designer. Since the inclusion of this table would have no compulsory usage, the subcommittee will consider inclusion of this valuable information in the appendix. MODIFY THE LAST SENTENCE TO INDICATE THAT THE EXISTING TABLE IS BEING MODIFIED AND HIS SUGGESTIONS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THAT MODIFICATION.~~
0007/0003	Hal Levin BERG	Section 6.2.3 Add "In no case shall this level of acceptability be less than 80%"	Rejected The IAQP is intended to afford the designer the flexibility to set acceptability levels in collaboration with the owner.
0007/0004	Hal Levin BERG	Section 6.2.4 Additional language "..CO2 is not a contaminant"	Reject Carbon dioxide is only one potential contaminant of concern to designers. This alternative path of compliance requires consideration of many variables. ~~The proposed language is informative. The best location for informative language is in the guideline if is not required for compliance.~~ ANOTHER POTENTIAL JUSTIFICATION FOR REJECTION IS THAT THIS VERSION OF THE IAQ PROCEDURE IS NOT FOCUSING ON SPECIFIC CONTAMINANTS (OTHER THAN THE TABLE OF GUIDELINES), BUT IS LEAVING THAT TO THE DESIGNER.
0007/0005	Hal Levin BERG	Section 6.1.1 Change "typical" to "not unusual"	Rejected This comment does not apply to the IAQP addendum. The modifications caused by this addendum to section 6.1.1 are only incidental to renumbering and don't apply to the IAQP.
0007/0006	Hal Levin BERG	Section 7.2.4	Reject, THIS SECTION IS NOT in addenda h, refer to appropriate subcommittee
0008/0001	Gary Kuhl Philip Morris	Section 6.1 Eliminate words from third bullet; residential, vehicular and industrial	~~Accept in principle~~ REJECT Until Std 62.2 is accepted, 62-1999 still addresses these other spaces.
0008/0002	Gary Kuhl Philip Morris	Section 6.1.3 Preserve certain language deleted by the proposed addenda DESCRIBE THE LANGUAGE A LITTLE MORE	Rejected ~~This comment applies to the VRP, which is not addressed by this addendum.~~ WHAT THE VRP ACCOMPLISHES IS NOT WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THIS ADDENDUM, WHICH IS INTENDED TO ONLY COVER HOW TO IMPLEMENT THE IAQ PROCEDURE

PM3006450033

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001

Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
0009/0001	Peter Lipowicz Philip Morris	Section 6.2.1 Change "cognizant authority" to "nationally recognized..." and include language about standardized testing	Reject The proposed IAQP is an alternative compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards. The proposed IAQP is not likely to be used unless the designer has a high degree of confidence in the procedures and data since all assumptions must be thoroughly documented. Nothing in this standard compels the use of contaminant data regardless of its' reliability. ~~TRY TO LINK YOUR RESPONSE TO THE COMMENT A BIT MORE. I GET YOUR POINT, BUT MAKE IT CLEARER THAT THERE IS NO NEED TO RESTRICT THE IAQP SO SEVERELY, AND THAT WE ARE NOT REQUIRING ITS APPLICATION AS YOU SO~~Commenter STATEs.
0009/0002	Peter Lipowicz Philip Morris	Section 6.2.2 Change "cognizant authority" to "nationally recognized..." and include language about standardized testing	Rejected The proposed IAQP is an alternative compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards. The proposed IAQP is not likely to be used unless the designer has a high degree of confidence in the procedures and data since all assumptions must be thoroughly documented. Nothing in this standard compels the use of contaminant data regardless of its' reliability. THERE IS NO NEED TO RESTRICT THE IAQP SO SEVERELY, AND THAT WE ARE NOT REQUIRING ITS APPLICATION AS Commenter STATEs ~~Accepted~~ ~~THE COMMENT LOOKS THE SAME AS THE PREVIOUS. BY AND LARGE, I THINK IT SHOULD ALSO BE REJECTED FOR THE SAME REASONS.~~

PM3006450034

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001

Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
0010/0001	Davor Novosel SEMCO Inc.	Section 6.2.3 Add language to clarify and make design level of acceptability for visitors only.	Reject The proposed IAQP is an alternative compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards. The occupant type and percent dissatisfaction of occupants are variables in the IAQP for the designer and owner to collaborate on. The proposed language allows the designer to design for visitors, occupants or both. This information must be included in the documentation, which is a deliverable to code officials.
0011/0001	Ed Fickes Fickes Eng.	Section 6.2 Delete entire section and move to guideline	Reject The proposed IAQP is an alternative compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards. The proposed IAQP is not likely to be used unless the designer has a high degree of confidence in the procedures and data since all assumptions must be thoroughly documented.
0011/0002	Ed Fickes Fickes Eng.	Section 6.2 Delete entire section	Reject The proposed IAQP is an alternative compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards. The proposed IAQP is not likely to be used unless the designer has a high degree of confidence in the procedures and data since all assumptions must be thoroughly documented.

PM3006450035

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001

Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
0011/0003	Ed Fickes Fickes Eng.	Section 6.2 Delete entire section	Reject The proposed IAQP is an alternative compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards. The proposed IAQP is not likely to be used unless the designer has a high degree of confidence in the procedures and data since all assumptions must be thoroughly documented. ~~The suggestion to reference "nationally recognized authorities..." has been incorporated. THIS THIRD SENTENCE MAY NEED TO BE CHANGED DEPENDING ON HOW PREVIOUS COMMENTS ARE DEALT WITH.~~
0011/0004	Ed Fickes Fickes Eng.	Section 6.2 Modify section ~~in accord with membership petition~~TO DELETE GENERIC DESCRIPTION OF IAQ PROCEDURE BASED ON MEMBERSHIP PETITION.	Reject The proposed IAQP is an alternative compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards. The purpose of the procedure is to provide acceptable indoor environments not just "ventilation system design.." In some cases operational and/or contaminant monitoring may be part of the design.

PM3006450036

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001

Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
0011/0005	Ed Fickes Fickes Eng.	Section 6.2.3 Delete section ON PERCEIVED AIR QUALITY.	Reject The subjective evaluation needs to be retained because one reason a designer might choose to use the IAQ Procedure is to achieve a specific level of occupant satisfaction, and subjective evaluation is an appropriate means (though not the only means) of determining whether they've succeeded. Note that subjective evaluations are not required; they are only listed as one way to evaluate the IAQ performance. ~~The proposed IAQP is an alternative compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards.~~ ~~The proposed IAQP is not likely to be used unless the designer has a high degree of confidence in the procedures and data since all assumptions must be thoroughly documented.~~ ~~YOU SHOULD SPEAK SPECIFICALLY TO THE ISSUE OF PERCEIVED AIR QUALITY. LOOK AT THE PROPOSED COMMENTS FROM THE FIRST PUBLIC REVIEW FOR SOME CANDIDATE WORDING.~~
0011/0006	Ed Fickes Fickes Eng.	Section 6.2.4 Modify section to delete references to IAQ and replace with "ventilation" based on membership petition	Reject The proposed IAQP is an alternative compliance path. The membership petition requires does not preclude any alternative path. ~~that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards.~~ ~~The proposed IAQP is not likely to be used unless the designer has a high degree of confidence in the procedures and data since all assumptions must be thoroughly documented.~~ ~~I THINK YOU NEED A MORE SPECIFIC RESPONSE BASED ON HIS CONCERN, RATHER THAN THE "GENERAL" ANSWER ABOVE.~~

PM3006450037

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001

Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
0012/0001	Dennis Stanke Trane Co.	Section 6.2.1 Add the following: "At a minimum, droplet nuclei resulting from human respiration shall be considered a contaminant of concern for all ventilation system designs"	Rejected ~~The proposed IAQP is an alternative compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards.~~ ~~Currently these droplet nuclei are not a specific contaminants of concern used to set other ventilation rates covered by this standard such as in the ventilation rate procedure. I WOULD RESPOND ALONG THE FOLLOWOING LINES:~~ THE IAQ PROCEDURE AS PROPOSED IS NOT SPECIFYING CONTAMS OF CONCERN, THAT IS THE DESIGNERS JOB. WE ARE NOT IN A POSITION TO DO SO YET. MAYBE IN THE FUTURE. However, see Appendix C for guidance on some contaminants of concern.
0012/0002	Dennis Stanke Trane Co.	Section 6.2.4 Clarify entire section to highlight the intent of the IAQP is to determine minimum airflow values.	Accepted as editorial. ~~Rejected~~ ~~The goal of the IAQP is not necessarily to specify minimum airflow values. " The IAQP is a performance based approach in which the *building* and its ventilation system are designed to maintain the concentrations of specific contaminants at or below certain limits identified during the building design target level of perceived IAQ acceptability by the occupants." SOME OF THE PURELY EDITORIAL CHANGES MIGHT BE WORTH CONSIDERING.~~
0012/0003	Dennis Stanke Trane Co.	Section 6.2.4 Delete "mass balance" and add "as part of a mass balance analysis" later in same sentence.	Accepted as editorial. Thank you.
0012/0004	Dennis Stanke Trane Co.	Section 6.2.4 Add, "in some cases....may be used.."	Accepted as editorial. Thank you.
0012/0005	Dennis Stanke Trane Co.	Section 6.2.4 Add 'to assure proper ventilation" delete "It is also acceptable to apply.."	Rejected The goal of the IAQP is not necessarily to specify minimum airflow values. " The IAQP is a performance-based approach in which the *building* and its ventilation system are designed to maintain the concentrations of specific contaminants at or below certain limits identified during the building design target level of perceived IAQ acceptability by the occupants." The changes as proposed are limiting statements deterring the designer from considering more than just ventilation.

PM3006450038

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001

Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
0012/0006	Dennis Stanke Trane Co.	Section 6.2.5 Change wording for consistency, tense and context. Suggests addition of sentence further clarifying documentation requirements when the IAQP is used with the VRP.	Accepted as editorial. Portion of comment dealing with possibility of additional language concerning documentation for using VRP in conjunction with IAQ procedure is rejected. See response to previous comment.
0013/0001	Forwood Wiser III Environmental Dynamics Grp.	IAQP Procedure too difficult to use and should provide *better* health and perceived A/Q than the VRP.	Rejected The goal of the IAQP is not necessarily to specify minimum airflow values. " The IAQP is a performance-based approach in which the *building* and its ventilation system are designed to maintain the concentrations of specific contaminants at or below certain limits identified during the building design target level of perceived IAQ acceptability by the occupants." The IAQP Procedure should not necessarily provide better IAQ. The committee will investigate additional clarity of IAQ verses PIAQ.
0014/0001	Hoy Bohannon RJR	Section 6.2.2 Delete reference to "cognizant authority"	Rejected. (copy from 001/002) ~~Accepted. Thank you.~~ ~~THIS MAY NOT BE ACCEPTABLE TO EVERYONE. COGNIZANT AUTHORITY IS PART OF OUR DEFINITION OF ACCEPTABLE IAQ.~~
0014/0002	Hoy Bohannon RJR	Section 6.2.2 Delete reference to "cognizant authority"	Rejected. (copy from 001/002) ~~Accepted in principle~~ ~~The use of "nationally recognized authority" will be substituted. NEEDS TO BE DISCUSSED.~~
0014/0003	Hoy Bohannon RJR	Entire section Delete entire section	Rejected The proposed IAQP is an alternative (not required) compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards.

PM3006450039

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001

Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
0015/0001	Mike Schell Engelhard Sensor Technologies	Section 6.2, Table 6.1 • Calculate rates based on unadapted occupants • Establish base ventilation rate • Move diversity considerations to operational section 6.1.3.2	Rejected There seems to be some confusion over the scope of addenda h. Specifically there is no table 6.1 proposed as part of section 6.2. It seems that the comment is more directed at the VRP than the IAQP. Also the proposed IAQP is an alternative compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. This includes design considerations such as adapted verses unadapted occupants, diversity levels and base ventilation rates. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards.
0015/0002	Mike Schell Engelhard Sensor Technologies	Section 6.2.4 Rework treatment of diversity	Rejected There seems to be some confusion over the scope of addenda h. There are no specific references to diversity in neither addenda section 6.2.4 nor Std. 62-1999. The proposed IAQP is an alternative, performance-based compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. This includes design considerations such as adapted verses unadapted occupants, diversity levels and base ventilation rates. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards.
0015/0003	Mike Schell Engelhard Sensor Technologies	Section 6.1.3.2 Rework treatment of diversity and base ventilation rate.	Rejected Section 6.1.3.2 is not covered by the scope of this addendum.
0015/0004	Mike Schell Engelhard Sensor Technologies	Section 6.1.1 Rework consideration of adapted verses unadapted occupants	Rejected Section 6.1.1 is not covered by the scope of this addendum.

PM3006450040

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001

Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
0016/0001	Paul Cammer Business Council on Indoor Air	Section 6.2 Place entire procedure in appendix.	Rejected The proposed IAQP is an alternative, performance-based compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards. As the commented suggests, the data may not be available for certain circumstances and types of occupancies but for others it may be a viable procedure that allows technological advances and calculation procedures. However, the proposed IAQP is not necessarily a "technology forcing" approach since the designer chooses when and when not to use the procedure and the application of it.
0016/0002	Paul Cammer Business Council on Indoor Air	Section 6.2 Replace "cognizant authority" with "nationally recognized authority"	Rejected. (copy from 001/002) ~~Accepted. Thank you.~~ ~~NEEDS TO BE DISCUSSED.~~
0016/0003	Paul Cammer Business Council on Indoor Air	Section 6.2.5 Eliminate the requirement for "exposure analysis"	Rejected The commenter uses the specific wording of "exposure analysis". These words are not found in the section 6.2.5. There are certainly some circumstances where the availability and applicability of emissions data does not instill sufficient confidence to use the IAQP. However, there are spaces that the IAQP may still have high confidence. The designer may choose to solicit (hire) outside assistance in some cases to perform source strength determinations. As an optional path of compliance the procedure that enables advances in technology and the other useful applications should not be precluded. The designer must make the determination of procedural applicability based on the data available, his experience and expertise as well as type of space and system being contemplated.

PM3006450041

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001

Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
0017/0001	Rodney Lewis Rodney Lewis Associates	Sections 6.2.4 & 6.2.5 Sections overly complicated based on Colliver Report.	Rejected The proposed IAQP is an alternative compliance path that gives the designer the ability to exercise their collective expertise, judgment and experience. This includes design considerations such as adapted verses unadapted occupants, diversity levels and base ventilation rates. The enforcement is available by examination of the "deliverables", specifically the extensive documentation requirements outlined in 6.2.5. There are many examples of this type of enforceability in other codes and standards. The proposed procedure is neither overly complicated nor simplistic. It depends on the application.
LC0001/01	Larry Holcomb Holcomb Environmental Services	Section 6.2 Eliminate references to perceived IAQ.	Rejected The express purpose of the IAQP is to control the concentration of specific contaminants of concern to design target levels and to achieve targeted design levels of occupant PIAQ acceptability. Unlike the commenter's stated rationale, these are not mutually exclusive goals. The subjective evaluation needs to be retained because one reason a designer might choose to use the IAQ Procedure is to achieve a specific level of occupant satisfaction, and subjective evaluation is an appropriate means (though not the only means) of determining whether they've succeeded. Note that subjective evaluations are not required; they are only listed as one way to evaluate the IAQ performance. ~~SEE RESPONSES TO FIRST PUBLIC REVIEW.~~
LC0001/02	Larry Holcomb Holcomb Environmental Services	Section 6.2.2 Add language compelling the designer to make references to concentration limits established by "an approved standard set". ~~HE ALSO WANTS TO~~ ELIMINATE THE REFERENCE TO TABLE 3 AND APP C. ~~YOU NEED TO RESPOND TO THIS AS WELL.~~	Rejected The designer's liability is to a large degree driven by their choice of compliance paths and application of it. While there is value to choosing an "an approved standard set" of concentration limits, the commenter doesn't reference approved by which governing body. This "approved set" is likely not available for all contaminants of concern. The guidance for the choice of appropriate concentration limits will get a broader explanation in the guideline. Nothing in the proposed language requires consideration of all airborne contaminants, only those of concern. Copy from 0012/001.

PM3006450042

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001

Comment	Commenter	Summary of comment	Response
LC0001/03	Larry Holcomb Holcomb Environmental Services	Section 6.2.3 Delete section.	Rejected The designer is required to consider both exposure levels to selected contaminants of concern and PIAQ of occupants. This makes the commenter's rationale in agreement with current proposed requirements. The rationale for using the term "perceived indoor air quality" in this section is this criteria is used to measure occupants perceptions. Health and contaminant exposure criteria are considered separately within this section The subjective evaluation needs to be retained because one reason a designer might choose to use the IAQ Procedure is to achieve a specific level of occupant satisfaction, and subjective evaluation is an appropriate means (though not the only means) of determining whether they've succeeded. Note that subjective evaluations are not required; they are only listed as one way to evaluate the IAQ performance. ~~SEE RESPONSES FROM FIRST PUBLIC REVIEW.~~
LC0001/04	Larry Holcomb Holcomb Environmental Services	Section 6.2.4 Remove references to "subjective occupant evaluations"	Rejected The rationale stated by the commenter points to potential limitations by using "subjective evaluations". These evaluations are augmented by control of contaminants of concern. The rationale for using the term "perceived indoor air quality" in this section is this criteria is used to measure occupants perceptions. Health and contaminant exposure criteria are considered separately within this section. The subjective evaluation needs to be retained because one reason a designer might choose to use the IAQ Procedure is to achieve a specific level of occupant satisfaction, and subjective evaluation is an appropriate means (though not the only means) of determining whether they've succeeded. Note that subjective evaluations are not required; they are only listed as one way to evaluate the IAQ performance. ~~SEE RESPONSES FROM FIRST PUBLIC REVIEW.~~

PM3006450043

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ngjj0001